



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

judgment as this is untenable there is no difficulty in showing. But it is not the theory of *genesis* Church of England Protestantism, for which alone we contend. We recognise the existence of the Church as a divinely instituted society, the members of which are not isolated individuals in their religious capacity, but are dependent on each other for instruction and edification. We hold, moreover, that the Head of the Church appointed an order of men whose special business and duty it is to teach the great doctrines of His religion, and to expound the Holy Scriptures which the Spirit has dictated for the perpetual instruction and guidance of the Church. The Church, again, in primitive times, when her teaching had not yet been corrupted by human additions and perversions of the truth, drew up Creeds and other formularies in which most of the grand fundamental principles of the Christian faith were embodied; and in her worship and ritual ordinances she furnished practical commentaries on such of the primary doctrines of the faith as were not expressly noticed in her dogmatic statements. A succession of writers, too, from the earliest times, have commented on the Scriptures, and transmitted to us the means of ascertaining, with more or less of exactness, what were the doctrines deduced from them by the great mass of Christians in the ages nearest to the apostolic times, and during which we may suppose the memory of the oral teaching of the Apostles still survived. Consequently, the man who, in the supposed exercise of his right of private judgment, takes up the Bible, and, disregarding every aid towards its interpretation, endeavours to deduce from it a system of religion for himself, acts, in reality, contrary to reason, and forgets that the *right* which he claims carries with it a corresponding *obligation* to omit no available means of coming to a right judgment. Would any one, desirous of becoming thoroughly acquainted with the meaning of an ancient classic author, be satisfied with merely studying the bare text, discarding all the aid that might be obtained from the labours of commentators, especially those who were nearly contemporaneous with the author himself? It may, indeed, be said that there is an essential difference between the study of the Bible and that of a profane author, inasmuch as the reader of the former is promised the aid of God's Holy Spirit to enlighten his understanding and to unfold to him the true meaning of the oracles of God. But it must be remembered that if the Holy Spirit be the gift of Christ, so also are the ordinances of His Church, and that no man has a right to expect a private and supernatural illumination, if he neglect to avail himself of the ordinary aids which God in His providence has placed within his reach.

What scope, then, it may be asked, is left for the exercise of private judgment in the formation of our religious opinions. To any one who asks this question in sincerity and earnestness we would reply—study the Bible in an humble and prayerful spirit. Examine the great doctrines of the faith, which all admit to be ancient, with the respect due to their antiquity, and all but universal reception. Compare them with the written word of God. Distrust your own judgment when you find it opposed to the consistent opinion of the vast majority of wise and learned and good men, who were as desirous to discover truth as you, and felt as much anxiety about the soundness of their belief as you do. In difficult and doubtful cases of interpretation, if you enter upon them at all, make use of the means proper and indispensable for coming to a rational determination. Keep a careful watch over your fancy and imagination, and beware lest your preconceived opinions, if you have any, unfairly influence your judgment. And, with respect to the particular points in dispute between Roman Catholics and Protestants, weigh dispassionately and fairly the evidence on both sides. Bring the dogmas in dispute to the test of Scripture and of the general analogy of the faith; and, depend upon it, if you exercise your right of private judgment in this spirit and in this way, you will neither, with the rationalist, reject any of the essential verities of the faith in which all Christians agree, nor, with the mediævalist, throw yourself into the arms of a supposed infallible Church, to believe implicitly and without inquiry everything that she may see fit to prescribe, no matter how opposed to God's word or man's common sense.

#### THE INVOCATION OF ANGELS.

In a former number we observed that Romish controversialists and theologians not unfrequently endeavour to support the practice of invoking saints by quoting passages of Holy Scripture, which they say speak of the worship or invocation of angels; whereas the two things are really distinct, and should be treated separately. We now repeat the same observation, and add that there are some features of difference between them. In the first place, the invocation of departed saints has no sanction whatever in the Scriptures; nothing which amounts to an intimation that it is permissible, and scarcely anything which the utmost ingenuity of schoolmen and divines can construe into an authority in favour of it. On the other hand, there are several passages of Holy Writ which at first sight would seem to indicate that religious service had been, or is to be, offered to angels, or that our prayers are to be directed to them. We shall, however, presently see that these afford no real countenance to our praying to or serving them. Then, again,

the two questions have each their peculiar difficulties, though they have many also in common. The difficulties with respect to the worship of angels will be seen as we proceed. Besides, also, it is to be observed that Roman Catholics do not practically regard the invocation of saints and that of angels in the same light; they seem to consider the former as much more important—at least we should say so, judging by the amount of prayers they offer to the angels and saints respectively. Romanists offer very few petitions to the angels; some none at all. We have before us an old French prayer-book, in which in the litany of the saints there are ninety-seven invocations of dead men and women, and only five in which the angels are addressed. It is much the same in all Romish devotional books, and, of course, in the private exercises of Roman Catholics themselves.

With respect to the service of angels, as practised in the Church of Rome, we have to consider it in two lights in which it naturally presents itself—first, the invoking them or addressing prayers to them; and secondly, the worship due to them. We shall chiefly occupy ourselves with reviewing the passages of Scripture adduced by Roman Catholics in support of the teaching of their Church.

As to the first, we may remark, as we have formerly done concerning the invocation of saints, the question resolves itself into these two propositions—that the angels know when we call on them to pray on our behalf, and that they do pray for us, even for each individually. This is supposing the case where angels are simply requested to pray for men. We shall see in the sequel that Roman Catholics are taught to pray directly to angels, and request favours from them. This raises another question, which we will also discuss.

Do angels, then, know when men invoke them? If the Roman Catholic address them intelligently he must be satisfied that they do. But this supposes that they know all things which are going on, at least on this our earth; for if there be one thing of which they are ignorant, that thing may be the petition that the good Romanist is directing to them. And if there is a possibility of their being ignorant of the prayer offered to them, it becomes unsafe to pray to them at all. It is in that case only a chance whether they can hear or not, and their petitioner runs the risk of being disappointed. That risk may be more or less—how much or how little we know not; it is a matter of uncertainty about which we can have no information, and which puts undoubting faith out of the question; and undoubting faith is necessary to prayer, at least the faith that the prayer will be heard, and may be answered. Do angels, then, know *all* things on earth? If they do, they are, at least as far as mankind are concerned, so many gods. We are not here going to trace out the labyrinthine mazes of the opinions of schoolmen and theologues with respect to the knowledge of angels—it would be an almost endless and unprofitable task; but we may just observe that it is a matter about which they differ very considerably. Let us see what Peter Dens says—"What things do angels know? Ans. They know God, themselves, and other angels; also, according to St. Thomas (Aquinas), all material things which are beneath them; also, when they know all natural causes, they know all future necessary things, but those future things which frequently are wont to happen from natural causes they can know by conjecture. Do angels know future free contingencies or those which depend upon free will? No; for to know these things is proper to God alone, according to that, 2<sup>nd</sup> lib. Paral. cap. 6. v. 30., 'Thou only knowest the hearts of the children of men,' &c." "Blessed angels can see our thoughts in God." St. Isidore of Seville, whom we have quoted in our number for March last, p. 27, says "that the angels know all things, even future things."

But of all this, and much more which might be quoted, it might be said that they are old, obsolete opinions, only existing in musty tomes in the libraries of the learned, but which exert no influence on the opinions of the many, and have practically nothing to do with the working of the Roman Catholic religion. Be it so. Let us see whether the modern teaching and entertained opinions of Roman Catholics represent the angels as possessed of this extensive knowledge, extending even to the thoughts of the heart, which the Scriptures teach us are known *only* to God. The Rev. S. Keenan, in his *Controversial Catechism*, has the following:—

"Q. Do not the angels and saints see *ALL* THINGS in God?

"A. Yes; and hence they must see our actions and hear our prayers in Him and through Him, as it is in Him we live and move and have our being. They see God face to face, and know Him even as they are known (1st Cor. xiii. 10, 11, 12)

"Q. Are not the angels and saints our guardians?

"A. Yes; and hence they *must* know *ALL* our actions, &c." This book of Mr. Keenan has been widely circu-

lated, and is published with the approbation of four vicars apostolic in Scotland, whose imprimatur it bears; it has also, we are told in the preface, been approved by Archbishop Hughes, of New York. This, surely, is modern teaching, and authorized teaching; and what is the amount of it? That saints and angels see *all* things in God; that is, they know all things, and are omniscient—that is, they are gods. Now, we wish to make no misrepresentation, and to take no unfair advantage; but we know no other meaning that the words of Mr. Keenan can have than that the saints and angels are omniscient—that is, possessed of infinite knowledge. If they are omniscient, they are so far at least equal to God, and to suppose them so is palpably idolatrous. It is, however, plain from Holy Scripture that the angels do not know all things. Our Lord Himself said, speaking of the day of His second coming, "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven." The Psalmist says of God that "His way is in the sea, and His path in the mighty waters, and His footsteps are not known." St. Paul beautifully says, "Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God, how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out; for who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been His counsellor?" If there be thus some secret counsels of divine wisdom into which no created being can penetrate, and if God's ways be thus inscrutable and past finding out, surely the angels cannot be said to know all things by seeing them in Him. Indeed, the opinion as to their knowing all things is so revolting to all our notions of one God, that we cannot think of refuting it. Infinite knowledge can only belong to an infinite being: if the angels be infinite in knowledge, they must possess all perfections in an infinite degree—that is, they must be all gods. If we conceive them to be omniscient we cannot stop short of conceiving them to be gods.

But if angels do not know all things, they know some things, and they know many things that occur on earth; they often come hither on errands of mercy, ministering to those who shall be heirs of salvation, and we are told "there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." Well, but do they hear when we pray to them? The mere assurance that the angels know something will not satisfy the intelligent inquirer so as to make him feel authorised in addressing his petitions to them. He must know that they are acquainted with his petitions. It will not satisfy him that "St. Michael the archangel" knows about somebody that was converted last week at the other end of the world, or even that his next door neighbour was converted to-day. He must have a definite answer to the question, Does the angel know *my* prayer? It is no use that the angel knows anything else, if he does not know *that*. DOES HE KNOW *THAT*? Where is the Roman Catholic who, when praying to an angel or a saint, if he should ask himself that question, is able to answer—I know that he hears me? If he has not that full assurance and firm persuasion, his prayers are quite unmeaning and useless; they resemble more a game of chance than anything else. But, supposing the angel should know about the prayer, does he know whether the prayer ought to be answered or not?

Besides, even if the angel should possess the knowledge requisite in such a matter, that is not enough. He must also be able to answer or grant the petition presented to him. The angels are often, we know, sent to various parts of God's wide universe: they do His bidding throughout creation. If, then, a Roman Catholic should pray to an angel, that angel may at that time be in some part of the universe, millions of millions of leagues away, not attending to his prayers, but something else which God may have commanded him to do. Now, according to Dens and Thomas Aquinas, an angel cannot be in more places than one at the same time,<sup>1</sup> so that the one prayed to may be out of the hearing of the petitioner, even though his be angelic hearing, and out of sight of the petitioner, even though his be angelic sight. Having other offices to look after, he may not be attending to the prayer, or may not be able to attend to it. He may not be looking on that "face" of God in which scholastic divines pretend the angels see the prayers offered to them, so that there are many possibilities that the angel may know nothing and be able to do nothing about the petition directed to him. Now, the Roman Catholic ought to be convinced that no one of these possibilities takes place, or that they are not possibilities, before he can be justified in offering up a single prayer to any angel.

Then, again, is it the angel's business to attend to the prayers of men at all? Have they anything to do with these prayers? The Scriptures nowhere say that they have. In all the passages of Holy Writ quoted on behalf of the Roman Catholic view of this question there are only two in which the Roman Catholics themselves say the angels are represented as offering prayers to God. It is well to consider these passages; one is Rev. viii., 4. "And another angel came and stood before the altar, having a golden censer, and there was given to him

<sup>1</sup> Petri Dens Tractatus de Angelis, n. 80, pp. 112, 113. Dublin, 1813.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> St. Isidori, sentent. lib. i., cap. x., tom. 6, p. 127. Rome, 1802.

<sup>4</sup> Keenan's Controversial Catechism, chap. xv., section 1, p. 139. Edinburgh, 1854.

<sup>5</sup> Mark xiii., 32.

<sup>6</sup> Rom. xi., 33, 34.

<sup>7</sup> Psalm lxxvii., 19.

<sup>8</sup> Petri Dens Tractatus de Angelis, n. 79, p. 111, tom. i. Dublin, 1813.

much incense that he should offer the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar, which is before the throne of God." Now, it is manifest from the passage itself that this was a priestly angel. According to the law of Moses none but the priest duly consecrated had a right to offer incense before God—Corah, Dathan, Abiram, and their followers, were consumed by fire and earthquake for daring to burn incense before Him—and "that no stranger which is not of the seed of Aaron should come near to offer incense before the Lord." This angel, then, must have been a priest; but he was also an universal high priest; for he offered the prayers of all saints. Who, then, is the priest in heaven? St. Paul will tell us (Heb. iv., 14): "We have," says he, "a great high priest that is passed into the heavens—Jesus, the Son of God." Who is He that offers up the prayers of all saints, but He to whom all saints send up their prayers? who but He who said to all, whatsoever you shall ask the Father in My name, that will I do (John xiv., 13, 14)? who but "He who heareth prayer, and unto whom all flesh shall come (Psalm lxxv. 2)?" We suppose, then, Christ to be the angel here spoken of, and in this view we are borne out by authorities standing high in the Romish Church. Ambrosius Ansbertus writes thus in his commentary on the Revelations:—

"And another angel came, &c. . . . But that angel came by the flesh, but he stood by his divinity. . . . What, also, is designated by the censor except the humanity of Christ? 'And there was given,' &c. But that compunction might be accepted of God, there was given to the angel incense; that is, to our Redeemer the care of our prayers are entrusted, &c., &c." Primasius, bishop of Utica, concurs in the same opinion. Albert the Great, Bishop of Ratisbon, the most eminent of the schoolmen, perhaps, with the exception of Thomas Aquinas, in his commentary on the Revelations says—"And another angel," that is, Christ, who is the angel of the great counsel (Isa. 9), according to another translation. And He is called an angel because He announces the Father to us, &c."

The other passage quoted by Roman Catholics to show that angels pray for us is Zechariah i. 12. It is, however, very likely that the angel here spoken of is none other than Christ Himself, as in the former instance. But, supposing that this should not be the case, and it is certainly somewhat questionable, there is nothing that can be called a prayer offered to God by the angel. He simply made an inquiry of the Lord of Hosts as to how long it would be ere he would have mercy upon and restore Jerusalem. He did not pray for the restoration of the city, but merely inquired about it. And what is very important to be borne in mind, Zechariah did not pray to the angel, nor ask the angel to pray for him.

So, then, we may say that these passages afford no countenance to the supposition that angels pray or present prayers to God. It is never once said in the Scriptures that angels pray. They are said to minister or serve us by the command of God, but never said to pray for us; nor are we taught to pray to them. St. Augustine says, "A mediator between us and God ought to possess a transient mortality and a permanent blessedness; that by means of that which is transient he might suit those that were to die, and that he might transfer them from the dead to that (happiness) which is permanent. Therefore, good angels cannot be mediators between wretched mortals and blessed immortals, because they themselves also are blessed and immortal."

Is there any authority for praying to or invoking angels? Roman Catholics say there is. Let us briefly examine the principal texts on which they rely.

1. In Genesis xviii. 2, three angels are said to have appeared to Abraham, and he is described as "bowing himself towards the ground" before them. Again, in Gen. xix. 1, Lot is said to have "bowed himself with his face towards the ground" before two of these angels. Roman Catholics assert that it is indisputable from these passages that both Abraham and Lot invoked or worshipped these angels. Those who urge this argument must suppose their readers to be very ignorant of Scripture, or else they would scarcely put it forward with such confidence. In another passage of Genesis (xxiii. 12) we are told that Abraham "bowed down himself before the people of the land;" that is, the children of Heth. The word here used (כָּרַע) is exactly the same as that which occurs in the two former passages. If, then, according to the argument used by Romanists, it is indisputable that Abraham and Lot invoked or worshipped the angels, it is equally indisputable that the patriarch Abraham invoked or worshipped the children of Heth! We believe that the Vulgate has contributed, in some degree, to lead Roman Catholics into error in this point. Speaking of Abraham and Lot (in Gen. xviii. 2, xix. 1) it uses the words "adoravit in terram" in both cases—"he adored to the earth." But (inasmuch as it uses the very same phrase in Gen. xxiii. 7) (Surrexit Abraham, et adoravit populum terræ, filios videlicet Heth—i.e., Abraham arose and adored the people of the land; that is, the sons of Heth), it is quite plain that the word "adored" (adoravit) cannot

be employed in the sense of invoking or worshipping; and this use of the word in Gen. xxiii. 7 ought really to have guarded Roman Catholic writers from falling into the mistake which we have pointed out, instead of leading them into error, as it seems to have done.

But further, we may add, that many ancient writers have asserted that it was our Lord Jesus Christ who appeared to the patriarchs, and especially to Abraham, under the form of an angel, as recorded in the book of Genesis. Thus, for example, Justin Martyr, who lived in the second century, and who is one of the earliest authorities for the belief of the primitive Church, next after the times of the apostles, writes as follows:—"Moses writes that God appeared to Moses at the oak of Mamre, as he sat in his tent door in the heat of the day. . . . By which it appears, as I said, that he who appeared to Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the other patriarchs, and is called God, was ordained by the Father, and was obedient to His will." Again, Origen, at the beginning of the third century, writes thus—"Observe, in the first place, that the Lord Himself came to Abraham with two angels, whereas only two angels proceed forward to visit Lot." Again, Clemens Alexandrinus, who lived at the close of the second century, thus writes—"Our schoolmaster, the holy God, Jesus, . . . appeared to Abraham." ὁ δὲ ἡμετέρος παιδαγωγός, ἄγιος θεὸς Ἰησοῦς . . . οὕτως ὡφθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ. Again, Tertullian, at the close of the second century, writes thus—"Christ Himself appeared to Abraham, in company with angels." We know that St. Augustine advocates a different view, and maintains that all the angels seen by Abraham were created angels; but his authority, however justly entitled to respect, cannot be placed against that of several writers, much older in point of time, and who, therefore, are more credible witnesses of the belief of the primitive Church in this point.

2. The next passage adduced by Roman Catholics in defence of the invocation of angels is Gen. xxii. 24, where an account is given of Jacob's wrestling with an angel; and Hosea xii. 4 is quoted to prove that Jacob, on this occasion, prayed to the angel with whom he wrestled. "Yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed; he wept and made supplication unto him; he found him in Bethel, and there spake with us, even the Lord God of Hosts: the Lord is his memorial." Now, nothing can be plainer than that Jacob prayed to this angel; but who was this angel? The passage itself tells us very unmistakably. It tells us that this angel was found by Jacob in Bethel; that there this angel spake with him (probably meaning with their forefathers); and that this angel was the Lord God of Hosts—He whose memorial or title is the Lord (Jehovah). Nothing, we think, can be plainer than that this is the meaning of the passage. The fifth verse expressly states that this angel was the Lord. And if we refer to the account of this matter in the Book of Genesis, we shall find the same view of the case most fully borne out. The angel, for instance, said to him, "Thy name shall no more be called Jacob, but Israel; for as a prince thou hast power with God" (שָׂרֵיָה (Sareetha)). So that the angel with whom, as Hosea said, he "had power" was, according to the angel's own words, God. We also read, "Jacob called the name of the place, Peniel (the face of God); for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." Which shows that Jacob himself considered that the angel was God. But the prophet says that Jacob found this angel at Bethel, and that there this angel spake with the people of Israel. This refers to Jacob's vision of the ladder reaching from earth to heaven, and upon the top of which stood the Lord, who then spake with him, and made many promises to him and his posterity. "And when Jacob awoke out of his sleep he said, the Lord is in this place: this is none other than the house of God. And he called the name of that place Bethel;" that is, the house of God. It is quite plain, then, that this angel was no mere creature, but the Lord God Himself.

We may add, that it appears from Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, and others, that this interpretation of the passage in question was held by the Church in the most ancient times. We have only space to quote one of these statements in full, that, namely, from Clemens Alexandrinus, "a most ancient man," "a most learned man," who lived at the close of the second century. "That it was the Word, the Schoolmaster of human nature, who wrestled with Jacob, is evident from this. Jacob asked him, saying:—Tell me thy name. And he said, why askest thou after my name? For, as yet, the Lord God was without a name, because he was not yet incarnate. And Jacob called the name of that place, The

image of God; for, saith he, I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved. But the face of God is the word by which God is made known. For then Jacob was called Israel, when he had seen the Lord God."

3. Another text adduced in defence of the invocation of angels is Genesis xlvii. 16, in which the words of Jacob are, "The God that fed me all my lifelong unto this day; the angel that delivereth me from all evil, bless the lads." Would not the very construction of these words show that "the angel" of the latter member is the same as "the God" of the former member of the sentence? There is no copulative conjunction between the two denoting a distinction; it is just the same as when he says in the same sentence, "God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me." These certainly are not two Gods, but one and the same; and we have no reason to suppose that "the angel" in the next clause denotes any other being. This is made even clearer by the use of the singular verb "bless." The original reads, בָּרַךְ (Yebaraik), bless he or let him bless, or he shall bless. The plural form would be יְבָרְכוּ (Yebarecoo), let them bless, or they shall bless. In the Vulgate also, the verb is singular, *benedicite*. Now, if God and the angel were not the same in this place, the verb would be plural instead of being singular. But how can God be called an angel? It is unquestionable that Christ is called an angel in Mal. iii. 1, when He is termed the Messenger or Angel of the covenant. And, indeed, He is constantly represented in the Old Testament under the character of angel, as in the New Testament Christ is designated by St. Paul as "the Apostle," which is a term of similar import. So also, Jesus Himself very often speaks of Himself throughout St. John's gospel as being sent by the Father; and the word angel simply means one sent on a message.

4. Again, Roman Catholic writers assert that the being who appeared to Moses at the burning bush (Exod. iii. 2), and to whom Moses did reverence, was a created angel, and it is said that he is distinctly called an angel by St. Stephen, in Acts vii., 30, and that this angel was with the Church in the wilderness, and was the same who spake to Moses at Mount Sinai. But if, as we have seen above, our Lord Jesus Christ is spoken of in the Old Testament as the angel of the covenant (Mal. iii. 1), and if He is described as the angel of God's presence (Isaiah lxiii., 9), the whole question at issue really is, not whether an angel appeared to Moses, for that is admitted, but whether this being was a created angel, or our Lord Jesus Christ. Now, in Exodus iii., 2, we are told that "the angel of the Lord" appeared to Moses in the midst of the bush, and in the fourth verse it is said that "God called unto him out of the midst of the bush." Surely, if it can be proved independently that God (in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ) is elsewhere called an angel, the passage before us almost inevitably leads us to identify the angel of whom it speaks with Christ Himself.

And so, we may observe, the passage was actually interpreted by many of the oldest and best authorities in the Church. We do not wish needlessly to multiply authorities, and, therefore, we can only refer to them very briefly. Thus, for example, Irenæus writes—"Christ Himself, therefore, with the Father, is the God of the living, who spoke to Moses, and who was manifested to the fathers." Again, Justin Martyr writes as follows:—"Our Christ appeared to Moses in a flame of fire at the bush, and said unto him, 'Put off thy shoes, &c.' Other passages might be quoted from Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian to the same effect."

It is sometimes argued, however, that, as St. Paul says, the law "was ordained by angels in the hand of a Mediator" (Gal. iii. 13); and as St. Stephen asserts, that the Jews received the law "by the disposition of angels" (Acts vii., 53), it must have been a created angel who delivered the law to Moses. The weakness of this conclusion, however, will be at once evident if we turn to Deut. xxxiii., 2, where we are told that "the Lord came from Sinai; He came with ten thousands of saints (or holy ones); from His right hand went a fiery law for them." To the same event the Psalmist refers when he writes (Ps. lxxviii., 17), "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place." These passages prove that angels were present at the giving of the law at Mount Sinai; but they prove equally that the Being from whom the law proceeded was no other than God Himself.

5. We need not dwell long on another passage which is sometimes quoted in defence of the invocation of angels, viz., 1 Tim. v. 21, "I charge thee before God and the elect angels." This passage proves, it is said, that we may call upon the elect angels, as St. Paul has here done. But does St. Paul call upon the angels in this passage? Surely not. He joins the angels with Jesus Christ, saith Theodoret, οὐχ ὡς ὑποτάκτους, ἀλλ' ὡς δοῦλους, "not as equal in honour, but as servants to Him;" as those who

\* Kai τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ὁμοίως Μωϋσῆς φησιν, ὡφθη ὁ θεὸς πρὸς τὸν δούτῃ τῷ Μαρβόλ κ.τ.λ.—Justin Martyr. Dial. cum Tryph. pp. 408, 409. London, 1722.

\* Primum tamen observo, quod Abraham cum duobus angelis etiam Dominus adfuit, ad Lot vero duo tantummodo angeli perierunt.—Origen, Hom. in Gen. Tom. i., col. 1. p. 71. Paris, 1723.

\* Christus. . . . ideoque et ipse cum angelis tunc apud Abraham. . . . apparuit. Tertull. adv. Marc. lib. 2, p. 402. Paris, 1675.

\* Gen. xxiii., 28. . . . Ibid. ver. 30.

\* Gen. xxviii., 16 to end.

\* Ἀνὴρ ἀρχαῖος, σοφός, ὁ Ζωόμενος.

\* Meo iudicio omnino eruditissimus.—Jerome.

\* Clem. Alex. Fed. Lib. i., p. 132. Oxon., 1715.—See also Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph. p. 407. London, 1722. Concil. Antioch. apud Routh. Rel. Sac. lib. p. 470.

\* Heb. iii. 1.

\* Ipse igitur Christus cum Patre, vivorum est Deus, qui locutus est Moysi, qui et Patribus manifestatus est.—Irenæus, lib. iv., c. xi., p. 282. Oxon., 1702.

\* ἐν ἰδίᾳ πυρὸς ἐκ βάτου προσωμίλησεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστός, καὶ ἐπενε. κ.τ.λ.—Justin Mart. Apok. i., p. 92. Lond. 1722.

\* Clem. Alex. Cohort. ad Genes. p. 7. Oxon., 1715. Tertull. Contr. Jud. c. 9, p. 194.

\* Numbers xvi., 40.

\* Ambrosii Ansberti Comment. in Apoc., lib. iv., fol. 497 C. D., tom. xlii. Bibliotheca Patrum de la Bigne. Lugd. 1677.

\* Primasii Afr. cap. Epist. Uticensis Comment in Apoc. lib. i., cap. 1, tom. x., fol. 289 D. Biblioth. ex Patrum de la Bigne. Lugdun., 1677.

\* Albertus Magnus in Apoc. viii., p. 67, tom. xi. Paris, 1651.

\* Augustin. de civitate Dei, lib. ix., cap. xv.

are to attend Him at the great day of judgment, and who will then be witnesses of the rewards which He will bestow upon all them who now obey Him, and keep His commandments.

6. Another passage adduced in defence of the invocation of angels is Apoc. i. 4, "Grace be with you, and peace from Him who is and who was and who is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before His throne." We will make no observation of our own upon this, but give the opinion, first, of one of the fathers, namely, Primasius. He says, "From the seven spirits who are in sight of the throne of God, on account of the sevenfold operation of the Holy Spirit, his spiritual is said to be septiform—that is, of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and fortitude, of knowledge and piety, and the fear of the Lord," &c. Ambrosius Ansbertus, a Roman Catholic writer of the Cistercian order, commenting on the same passage, says, "But when the Spirit of the Father and the Son is one and the same person in one Trinity, wherefore does John in this Revelation introduce seven spirits, except he intended to denote the sevenfold operation of one and the same Spirit by the sevenfold appellation of spirit? This is what the prophet had in view when he represented the one spirit of the Lord as resting upon our Redeemer, saying, 'The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him.' Presently into the one he introduces seven, and says, 'The spirit of wisdom and of understanding, the spirit of counsel and of might, the spirit of knowledge and of piety, and the spirit of the fear of the Lord shall fill Him.'" But we need not go so far away for this view of the case. The edition of the Douay Bible published in Dublin, under the sanction of the late Archbishop Troy, in the year 1816, has the following note on this passage—"From the seven spirits, &c. The Holy Ghost may be here meant and so called, for His sevenfold gifts and graces, as some expositors think." The note then goes on to say that it is a preferable interpretation which supposes angels to be meant.

Now, with respect to the worship of angels, a word must be said. Passages are quoted from the Old Testament where angels are said to be worshipped; such as in the case of Abraham and Lot (Genesis xviii, xix). Of this, Dr. Delahogue, professor in Maynooth College, says, in his Treatise on the Incarnation, in the appendix, "It is very uncertain whether they knew them as angels, and, therefore, whether that adoration was not mere civil honour." We have already proved, by reference to the Hebrew texts of those passages, that no adoration was intended in either case.

Besides these, the cases of Balaam and Joshua worshipping angels are supposed to give authority to that practice. In the case of Joshua the angel said, he was captain of the Lord's hosts. Now, this word *Mal'ak* (Sar), or prince, is applied to angels in the Book of Daniel; but it is also applied to Christ in the prophet Isaiah, where He is called the Prince of Peace. In the New Testament He is called the Captain of our salvation. Other similar appellations are referred to Him in both Old and New Testaments. Well, then, supposing this Prince of the Lord of Hosts to be Christ, it is no way wonderful that He should be worshipped; but if an angel, it is wonderful, indeed, and we should pause well before we come to that determination. The angel, for such we will call Him for the present, told Joshua to take off his shoes from off his feet, for the ground on which he stood was holy. There is only another instance of the like in the Scriptures, namely, where God appeared to Moses in the bush. In that case it was God Himself who gave the command. Why was the ground holy? Because it was sanctified by the Divine presence, in the same way as the holy of holies in the tabernacle and temple was sanctified by the peculiar manifestation of the Deity; in the same manner as heaven itself, the true sanctuary, is hallowed by the full and unclouded display of God's glory. Angels appeared on other occasions; they never made any such command as that of taking off the shoes. That homage is due only to God; and still in the East it is a piece of the divine worship. So that this circumstance shows that it was no less than God who thus appeared to Joshua. But in one of the following verses (ver. 2, cap. vi.), the same narrative being still carried on, this person is called the Lord (Jehovah), and He gives directions to Joshua about the taking of Jericho, as it was for this purpose He thus appeared to Joshua.

But, then, as to the case of Balaam, it is not at all likely that he either offered or intended to offer religious worship by falling down to worship the angel. This angel, however, might be shown to be God Himself, thus visibly apparent. Balaam intended to reverence the angel; but it does not appear that he offered religious reverence. Where is the Protestant that, if he were to see an angel, would not bow before him, and render him obeisance as a superior being? Yet, he would not be rendering him any religious worship. We have two instances in Scripture of religious worship having been offered to angels, and on both occasions they refused to accept it. These were the cases in which St. John was about to

commit idolatry, but was checked by the command, "worship God."

It has already been shown in the pages of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN how dishonestly Roman Catholics have treated the passages of Scripture in which we read that the angels refused to be worshipped. To our minds such a refusal seems a sufficient ground for the rejection of angel worship. We are told that it may be because the apostle offered to the angel that worship which was due only to God. That is very true, because all religious service is due only to God: it cannot be given to any other without idolatry. Now, wherein consists the difference between mere civil honour and religious worship? Civil honour appears to consist, in general, in the awarding of praise to merit, the conferring of privileges, the ascription of superiority to any, the external acts by which our sense of that superiority or worth is expressed, and those various means of denoting esteem and respect which custom and the laws of human society sanction. Divine worship, which is properly all of religious worship, consists in the uplifting of the heart to the object worshipped, the reposing of the soul's best and highest affections upon Him, the acknowledgment and sense of complete dependance on and entire subjection to Him, the consecration of our lives and energies to His service, and the hope of spiritual and eternal good to be obtained from Him, through Him, and in Him; and all external actions of whatever kind by which these feelings are expressed. Each and all of these properly belong to religious worship, and none of them can be referred to any being besides the one God set forth in the Gospel, without incurring the guilt of idolatry. Now, the first of these, which we call civil honour, or that which one man renders to another, may be referred in kind by one creature to another, or by man to an angel; but divine worship, or religious service, cannot in whole, or in part, be referred to any besides the Great Creator and Governor of the universe. This worship is described in Scripture as one that must be in spirit and in truth.

We are told in the Gospel that the angels of God's children do always behold the face of our Father in heaven. Upon this expression Romish theologians build a curious and fanciful superstructure: they imagine that the angels perceive in this face of God all things, past, present, and to come, and, among the rest, the prayers offered to them by men on earth. They imagine this "face" of God to be a sort of mirror, in which the blessed spirits see reflected the images or ideas of things, and that hence they know these things. But this expression does not afford any authority to such a fabrication. Seeing the face of God does not denote the image of things reflected therein, but simply enjoying His favour, and living and being happy in His presence. It means, also, actually beholding the manifestation of the Divine Being, of whatever kind that may be. In a passage above cited, Jacob said, "I have seen God face to face." Moses also saw God, and "talked with Him face to face," and this while they were on earth; yet who will say that these good men saw in that face the images of all things, and so knew all things?

The Jewish high priest, when blessing the people, prayed that God would "cause His face to shine upon" them, and that He would "lift up the light of His countenance upon" them. Surely this benediction did not mean that they might see all things in that Divine countenance. So, also, St. Paul, when he said he should see God face to face, did not mean that the face of God was a mirror in which the images of things are reflected, but that he should really see divine truth, not through the veil of mortality, as now; not darkly, as through a perspective glass, but immediately and truly and without distortion or refraction, if we may use such a term in such a matter. In a quotation given above, Mr. Keenan represents St. Paul as saying that he should know God even as he was known. If saints or angels may know "God" even as they themselves are known, then there is an end of Godhead altogether; then they know God intimately and perfectly, as well as He knows them; then they are as much God as He is. St. Paul, however, says no such thing as this. The word "God" is foisted in by Mr. Keenan himself, and alters the sense considerably.

Peter Dens and Thomas Aquinas inform us that there are three hierarchies of angels—the highest, the middle, and the lowest—and each of these consisting of three orders. In the highest, say they, are cherubim, seraphim, and thrones; in the middle, dominations, virtues, and powers; in the lowest, principalities, archangels, and angels. As it must be hard for them to prove this, it must be equally hard for us to refute it.

We Protestants do not pretend to be wise above that which is written, nor do we pretend to be able to tell how the angels know things, or what things they know. We simply say that we know nothing about these matters, and, consequently, if we address our prayers to them we can have no assurance that they will be heard or regarded. We do not pretend to know how many angels there are, what is their power, or what is their occupation, and, consequently, we have no knowledge that they can or will attend to any petition of ours. But we know, on God's own authority, that there is One whose office it is to take our wants and our requests into consideration—One who always hears and even knows our prayers before we utter them. We know that He has power to do exceedingly

above all that we ask or think, and that His mercy and goodness are co-infinite with His ability. That saints or angels can hear or pray for us is at best a sheer uncertainty; that Christ hears and intercedes for us admits of no doubt whatever. And we do not feel disposed to risk a certainty for an uncertainty, to leave a sure and sufficient Mediator for those of whom it is most likely that they are no mediators at all. We do not dishonour the angels or saints; we rather give them the true honour, and what we conceive to be the only true honour; for any honouring of them that is not just we believe to be dishonour, because not compatible with God's will, and therefore not pleasing to those holy beings, who delight in that will. We will not put them in the place of their Creator, nor give them any portion of that undivided service which we owe Him. They seek no such service, nor would they accept it. They glory in being fellow-servants with us of our common God, co-heirs with us of one common glory, and participants with us of the same divine nature. Our plan is rather to endeavour to serve our Master and theirs, as we are told they serve Him, with cheerful and willing hearts, with all the faculties of our souls, and during all the days of our existence, and so shall we join them in the bright heaven held out to us, and bask in the light of that Divine countenance before which all clouds of doubt and ignorance shall be dispelled, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.

May we all, Roman Catholics and Protestants, who read these lines, join the brilliant host in no matter how humble an order, and unite with them in ascribing glory, honour, and majesty to Him who died and rose again, and now pleads for us on high, the blessed Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world.

## THE TABLES TURNED; OR, WHAT HAPPENED TO LARRY O'DONOVAN ON MONDAY.

### PART II.

LARRY was very well pleased with his Sunday's work, and he began to think that in the wide world there was not such a useful guide for a poor man as Mr. Furniss.

"It is a fine thing," said he to himself, "to have a little education. If I was not able to read, how could all things be so clear to me as they are now that I see them in the book. No wonder the priest is advising everybody to buy 'What Every Christian must Know and Do.'"

The nice new coat he had bought made his old trousers look so shabby, he resolved to thrash some oats at once. In two or three days' time he bought some cloth at his neighbour's shop, and put the materials into the hands of Tom Stack, who promised to have them ready on Monday, the fair day.

Accordingly, he sent his sister Mary over early on that day; and after a little delay, she returned with the wished for article of dress, and Larry proceeded to get ready for a walk through the fair.

When he examined the trousers, he thought them small and skimpy looking, and when he put them on he found them very tight and not nearly long enough. In fact, they did not reach near his ankles. "Oh, murder," said he, "that villain Stack; was there ever such a thing as an honest tailor? and Mr. Carty said I had plenty of the cloth to make them large and roomy."

Boiling with rage, he rushed down street into Stack's house, and accused him of being a plundering villain. "What are you at, at all, at all, to be meddling with my character in that sort of a way?" said the little tailor. "I wonder at you to be so high your passion." "No wonder at all," retorted Larry. "Did you ever see such a show as you have made of me?" "Sure if they are a little short," said the tailor, "they'll gather the less mud on a wet day. How do you know but it's the fashion to have them a little tight and short?"

"Fashion, indeed. Maybe you want to have me like one of them savages out in New Zealand. Sure I heard that when some clothes were sent out to them, one of the outlandish fellows mistook a great coat for a pair of breeches, and thrust his legs into the arms and threw the skirts over his shoulders. Do you want to have me like one of them. I've a mind to knock you down for stealing my cloth."

"Steal. Do you take me to be a rogue," shouted the little tailor.

Just at this moment who should pass by but the Rev. Laurence O'Toole, the priest, a fine, tall, clever, elderly gentleman, with such respectable gray hair; none of your hot Maynooth priests, who would settle every dispute with the stick. Hearing the noise he turned into the tailor's house, and asked what was the matter?

"He's just after accusing me of being a thief," said Stack; "and your reverence knows well I have too great a regard for the laws of God and the Church to be any such thing."

"Do you mean to say you put all my cloth into the trousers, and that you kept none?"

"I am no thief, I say."

"Did I not tell ye all to buy that nice little book by Mr. Furniss, and that you could not have a better guide?"

"And so I did, your reverence, and it is my study often; and sure he says it is no sin to keep pieces of cloth whenever there is a common custom of doing it; and sure the book is called 'What Every Christian must Know and Do.' It is not what they may do, but what they must do. So it is clear to me that a Christian tailor must keep the pieces of cloth."

\* Primasius Episc. Utic. Apoc. lib. i., cap. i., fol. 289 D., tom. x. Biblioth. Patrum de la Bigne. Lugd. 1677.

\* Ambrosius Ansbertus Comment. in Apoc. lib. i., fol. 414 G., tom. x. Biblioth. Patrum de la Bigne. Lugd. 1677.

\* Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 9. \* Mat. xviii. 10. Numb. vi., 25, 26.